

25 September 1967

Lt. Gen. Marshall S. Carter, U. S. Army
Director, National Security Agency
Fort George G. Meade,
Maryland, 20755

Dear Pat:

I firmly support the views which you expressed in your letter to me on 11 September 1967. More explicitly, I am convinced that we must eventually accomplish an overall evaluation of multipurpose collectors and their contributions to our national intelligence objectives. Furthermore, your comments concerning the limitations and hazards of evaluating a collection system with respect to its contribution to a single intelligence problem can be firmly based in fact. However, I think you will agree that we can accomplish the overall evaluation in several consistent and carefully taken steps. We consider the evaluation of the collection systems used on the Soviet ICBM threat to be the first step toward a capability for evaluation of the overall threat.

You indicated in your letter that we should not attempt to merge independent evaluation and make dollars statements covering systems which have two or more intelligence goals. I think that you have mistaken our objective; we do not intend to disregard or make decisions without regard to the multipurpose nature of collection systems. The

intention of this study is to describe the effectiveness of pertinent systems as they are applied against an isolated goal; given limited resources, we should be able to better apply these resources to more fully accomplish the specific goal. We have chosen the ICBM problem as one goal and we intend to make conclusions which simply describe a collector's contribution to that specific goal. The next step could be the Soviet ABM or the Ground Forces. I do not believe that we will be able to recommend the elimination of a multipurpose collector simply because of its marginal contribution to the ICBM problem. However, we may be able to direct improvement or elimination of certain pure collectors of limited utility.

As you suggested in your letter, our representatives have discussed the course of action which should be taken regarding this study. I am not particularly pleased with their progress, it was unfortunate that they have spent a great deal of time trying to solve the overall problem rather than making a contribution to what I consider the first building block.

JOHN A. BROSS
D/DCI/NIPE